


REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. No changes have been made to the claims.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action objects to the structures in claims 1 and 9 which depict a bond using a broken line parallel to a solid line (bonds "a", "b" and "c"). Said depiction is asserted to represent a resonance structure. Applicant respectfully submits that it would be clear to one skilled in the art from the specification that this is not intended, but rather that the structures indicate the choice of a single or a double bond, and not an intermediate bond, as in a resonance structure. For example, structures (II) and (III) in the specification (pp. 3-4) depict embodiments in which bond "a" in formula (I), claim 1, is a double bond or a single bond, respectively. Likewise, each of bonds "b" and "c" in structure (IV) in claim 9 is limited to being either a single or double bond. As recited in claim 9 and on page 7, "bonds 'b' and 'c' are single or double bonds, provided that one of b and c is a single bond and the other is a double bond." Applicant also points out that one of his earlier applications, now issued as U.S. Pat. No. 6,602,831, employs notation very similar to that used in structure (IV) of the present application.

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for discussing these points on May 23, and agreeing that the meaning of the notation used for bonds a, b and c is clear in context. However, if the Examiner has any further concerns regarding the application, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to discuss the issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Crimaldi  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,968  
Telephone No.: (847) 649-3891

Rohm and Haas Company  
100 Independence Mall West  
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399  
May 23, 2006